jam productions, ltd.

**NATHAN BENDITZSON** 

FYI -

ONIGNAL CAN BE FOUND ON

TOP, FOLLOWED By 9 COPIES,

PER WEBSITE GUDE LINES.

EACH COMMENT IS ONE

PAGE IN LENGTH

SINCERCLY

207 WEST GOETHE-CHICAGO. II LINOIS-60610-312-266-6262-EAX: 33.2-266-9568

jan productions, ltd.

NATHAN EENDITZSON, ESQ nathanb@jamusa.com

207 WEST GOETHE • CHICAGO, ILLINOIS • 60610 312-266-6262 • FAX: 312-266-9568

#### DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

January 8, 2003

JAN 1 4 2003

RECEIVED & INSPECTED

CO MAU BOOM

#### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23,2002)

To: The Secretary, FCC Commissioners, and Chief, Media Bureau:

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, 1 strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

I support the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

As an employee of Jam Productions, Ltd.. the country's largest independent concert and theatrical promoter, I can speak first hand about the effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced the detrimental effects of consolidation in the concert industry.

In the concert industry. Clear Channel, the largest concert promoter in the country controls the vast majority of the live concen business. Clear Channel has exclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country, blocking access to other promoters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fees to the artists they promote are so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to the consumer, resulting is incredibly high-priced concert tickets, outside the reach of many fans. This has caused concert ticket prices and service charges to rise more than 60% over the past 6 years.

The same consolidation in the concert industry is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating the remaining media concentration rules, the diversity and independence of media outlets will be eroded so greatly as to leave the consumer with fewer choices in music. A few large corporations will control what music gets played and how often. resulting in bland. "safe" programming with little diversity, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests. not the interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporations to *vary* radio broadcasts, create unique programming. or veer from playing the songs they want to promote, resulting in "less choice and no voice" for the consumer.

In addition, since 1996 radio stations have become very formidable competitors of concert promoters by offering radio airplay and promotion in exchange for the artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concert promoters cannot compete against radio stations concerts since we cannot offer anything that could match airplay and promotion.

As such, the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question

Sincerely,

JAM Productions, Ltd.

No. 40 di resolt OHC

### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

'To: The Secretary, FCC Commissioners. and Chief, Media Bureau:

I am writing to you today to comnient on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ounership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. Those rules serve the public interest by limiting the iiiarkct power of already huge companies in ilie broadcast industry.

Isupport the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to liold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation froin the public. The rarified, lawyorly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is nor an appropriate decision-making vonue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With tlie serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it Is important that the Commission rake the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

As an employee of Jam Productions, Ltd., the country's largest independent concert and theatrical promoter, 1 can speak first hand about the effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced the detrimental effects of consolidation in the concert industry.

In the concert industry, Clear Channel, the largest concert promoter in the country controls the vast majority of the live concert business. Clear Channel has exclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country, blocking access to other promoters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fees to the anists they proniote are so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to the consumer, resulting is incredibly high-priced concentickets, outside the reach of many fans. This has caused concert ticket prices and service charges to rise more than 60% over the past 6 years.

The same consolidation in the concert industry is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating the remaining media concentration tules, the diversity and independence of media outlets will be eroded so greatly as to leave the consumer with fewer choices in music. A few large corporations will control what music gets played and how often, resulting in bland. "safe" programming with little diversity, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests. not the interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporations to vary radio broadcasts, create unique programming, or veer from playing the songs they want to promote. resulting in "less choice and no voice" for the consumer.

In addition, since 1996 radio stations have become very formidable competitors of concert promoters by offering radio airplay and promotion in exchange for the artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concert promoters cannot compere against radio stations concerts since we cannot offer anything that could match airplay and promotion.

As ruch, the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question

Sincerely,

AM Productions, Ltd

4114th y 0, 2000

# FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review -Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23,2002)

To: The Secretary, FCC Commissioners, and Chief, Media Bureau:

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

I support the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

As an employee of Jam Productions, Ltd., the country's largest independent concert and theatrical promoter, I can speak first hand about the effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced the detrimental effects of consolidation in the concert industry.

In the concert industry, Clear Channel, the largest concert promoter in the country controls the vast majority of the live concert business. Clear Channel has exclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country, blocking access to other promoters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fees to the artists they promote are so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to the consumer, resulting is incredibly high-priced concert tickets, outside the reach of many fans. This has caused concert ticket prices and service charges to rise more than 60% over the past 6 years.

The same consolidation in the concert industry is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating the remaining media concentration rules, the diversity and independence of media outlets will be eroded **so** greatly as to leave the consumer with fewer choices in music. A few large corporations will control what music gets played and how often, resulting in bland, "safe" programming with little diversity, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democratic voice ofconsumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests, not the interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporations to vary radio broadcasts, create unique programming, or veer from playing the songs they want to promote, resulting in "less choice and no voice" for the consumer.

In addition, since 1996 radio stations have become very formidable competitors of concen promoters by offering radio airplay and promotion in exchange for the artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concert promoters cannot compete against radio stations concerts since we cannot offer anything that could match airplay and promotion.

Λ -		41	1		_ 11	- 441							•	auestion
ΔC	CHICH	TηΔ	 CHAIL	nreran	211	OTT DA	CHITTANT	mballa	OWNDARS	nın	rillae	naw	ın	111125111111

Sincerely.

Mary Beth Kelly

JAN 1 4 2003

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

In Hic Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rivers and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. MM Docket Nn. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

To The Secretary, FCC Commissioners, and Chief, Media Bureau:

Tam writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believ Lihat itic 100 should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

Isupport the FCC's plan to fiold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I strongly encourage llic Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyorly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come our aild meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow tlie American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

As an employee of Jam Productions, Ltd., the cotintry's largest independent concert and theatrical promoter, I can speak first hand about the effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced the detrimental effects of consolidation in the concert industry.

In the concert industry, Clear Channel, the largest concert promoter in the country controls the vast majority of the live concert business. Clear Channel lias exclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country, blocking access to other promoters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fees to the artists they prointee are so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to the consumer, resulting is incredibly high-priced concert tickets, outside the reach of inany fans. This has caused concert ticket prices mid service charges to rise more than 60% over the past 6 years.

The same consolidation in itic concert industry is affecting the broadcast industry. By climinating the remaining media concentration rules, the diversity and independence of inedia outlets will be eroded so greatly as to leave the consumer with fewer choices in music. A few large corporations will control what music gets played and how often, resulting in bland. 'safe' programming with little diversity, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, tlic democratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests, not the interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporations to vary radio broadcasts, create unique programming, or veer from playing the songs they want to promote, resulting in "less choice aild no voice" for the consunier.

In addition, since 1996 radio stations have become very formidable competitors of concert promoters by offering radio aimlay and promotion in exchange for the artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concert promoters cannot compete against radio station, conceits since we cannot offer anything that could match airplay and promotion.

As such, the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question.

Sincerely,

JAM Productions, Ltd.

Caryn Bussel

### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington. DC 20554

JAN 1 4 2003

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Owner hip Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant tu Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

To The Secretary, FCC Commissioners, and Chief, Media Burcau:

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCCs broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

I support ilie FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this malter in Richmond, VA in February 2001. I strongly circourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC ruleinaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out aiid meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the iiiiic to review these issties inore thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

As iiii employee of Jam Productioiis. Ltd., the country's largest iiidepeiident concert and theatrical proincler. I can speak first hand about the effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having expenenced the detrimental effects of consolidation in the concert industry.

In the concert industry. Clear Channel, llic largest concen promoter in the country controls tlie vast majority of llic live concert business. Clear Channel has exclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country, blocking itecess to other proinoters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entellainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fees to the artists they proinote are so exorbitant, that they inust pass along this cost to the consumer, resulting is incredibly high-priced concert tickets, outside the reach of many fans. This has caused concert ticket prices and service charges to rise more than 60% over the past 6 years.

This same consolidation in the concentinuity is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating the reinaining media concentration rules, the diversity and independence of inedia outlets will be eroded so greatly as lo leave the consumer with fewer choices in music. A few large corporations will control what music gets played and liow often resulting in bland, "safe" programming with little diversity, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests, not the interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporations to vary radio broadcasts, create unique programming, or veer froin playing the songs they want to proinote, resulting in "Iess choice and no voice" for the consumer.

In addition, silice 1996 radio stations have become very formidable competitors of concert promoters by offering radio airplay and promotion in exchange for the artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concert promoters cannot compete against radio stations concerts since we cannot offer anything that could match airplay and promotion.

As such, the FCC should relain all of the current media ownership rules now in question.

Sincerely

JAM Productions, Ltd.

Yohyi Soss

# FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

JAN 1 4 2003

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

To The Secretary, FCC Conimissioners, and Chief. Media Bureau

I ani writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public iiilerest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

I support the FCC's plait to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. 'fie rarified, lawyorly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

As an employee of Jam Productions, Ltd., the country's largesl independent concert and theatrical promoter, I can speak first hand about the effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced the detrimental effects of consolidation in the concert industry.

In the concert iiidustry, Clear Channel, the largest concert promoter in the country controls the vast majority of the live concert business. Clear Channel has exclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country, blocking access to other promoters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fces to the artists they promote are so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to the consumer, resulting is incredibly high-priced concert rickets, outside the reach of many fans. This has caused concert ticket prices aiid service charges to rise more than 60% over the past 6 years.

The same consolidation in the concert industry is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating the remaining media concentration rules, the diversity and independence of media outlets will be eroded so greatly as to leave the consumer with fewer choices in music. A few large corporations will control what music gets played and how often, resulting in bland, "safe" programming with little diversity, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their owii interests, not the interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporations to vary radio broadcasts, create unique programming, or veer from playing the songs they want to promote, resulting in "less choice and no voice" fur the consumer.

In addition, since I996 radio stations have become very formidable competitors of concert promoters by offering radio airplay and promotion in exchange for the artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concen promoters cannot compete against radio stations concerts since we cannot offer anything that could match airplay and promotion.

A5 such, the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question

Sincerely,

Karin M. Schwab

JAM Productions. Ltd.

# I MAL

JAN 1 4 2003

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Brnadcast Ownership Rules and Other Ruler Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept 23, 2002)

To The Secretary, FCC Coniiiussioners, aiid Chief, Media Bureau

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No 02-277, the Bicnnial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to proinote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that Ilic FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the piblic interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

I support the FCC's plan to hold a public licaring on tlus matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I stroiigly circourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the piiblic. The ranfied, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage llic Commissioners to coinc out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy. It is important that the Commission take the time to review three issues inore thoroughly aild allow the American people to have a meaningful say in thic process.

As an employee of Jam Production. Ltd., the country's largest independent concert and theatrical promoter. I can speak first hand about the effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced the detrimental effects of consolidation in the concern industry

In the coilccri industry Clear Channel, the largest concen promoter in the country controls the vast majority of the live coilccrt business. Clear Channel has exclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country. blocking access to other promoters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clem Channel's guaranteed fees to the artists they promote are so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to the consumer, resultilig is incredibly high-priced concen tickels, outside the reach of many fans. This has caused coilccrl ticket prices and senice charges to rise more than 60% over the past 6 years.

The same coiisolidation in the concentindustry is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating like remaining iiiedia concentration rules, the diversity and independence of media outlets will be eroded so greatly as to leave the consumer with four clioices in inusic. A few large corporations will control what inusic gets played and how often resulting in blaiid, "safe" programming with little diversity, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporalions work to serve their own interests, ito the interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporalions to vary radio broadcasts, create unique programming, or veer from playing the songs they want to proliiote, resulting in "less clioice and no voice" for the consumer.

In addition, silicc 1996 radio stations have becoine very formidable coinpetitors of concen promoters by offering radio airplay aild promotion in exchange for the artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concert profiliolers cannot compete against radio stations concerts since we cannot offer anything that could inatch airplay and promotion

4 s such, Hic FCC should retain all of the current media ownership niles now in question

Sincerely

IAM Productions Ltd.

Mike Lynske

#### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

JEN 14 2003

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulator) Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

To The Sccretary, FCC Coinniissioners, and Chief. Media Bureau.

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership niles. In its goals to promote coinpetiuon, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current inedia ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the inarker pouer of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

I support tlic FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this malter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I strongly encourage Ilic Coinmission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation froin the public. The rarified, lawyerly almosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-niiking venue when questions as profoiind as the freedom of our media are at slake. I encourage the Coininissioiiers to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more llioroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

4s an employee of Jam Productions, Lid.. rlic country's largest iiidepeiident concert and theatrical proiiioter. I can speak first hand about the effects of industry coiisolidation in the broadcast industries, having experieiiced rlie detrimental effects of consolidation in the coiicen industry.

In the concert industry, Clear Channel, the largest concert promoter in the country controls the vast majority of the live colicert business. Clear Channel lias exclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country, blocking access to other promoters, resulting in less clicic available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fees to the artists they profiliote are so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to the consumer, resulting is incredibly high-priced concert tickets, outside the reach of many fans. This has caused concert licket prices and service charges to rise more than 60% over the past 6 years.

This same consolidation in this concentration that it is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating the remaining iiiedia concentration rules, the diversity and independence of media outlets will be eroded so greatly as to leave the colisiiiiic with fewer choices in music. A few large corporations will control what music gets played aild how often resulting in bland. "safe" programming with little diversity diministring the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the delilocratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests, not the interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporations to vary radio broadcasts, create unique programming, or veer from playing the songs they want to profificle, resulting in "less clicic and no voice" Cor the consumer.

In addition, since 1996 radio stations have become very formidable competitors of concen promoters by offering radio airplay and promotion in exchange for the artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concen promoters caiinol compete against radio stations concens silice we cannot offer anything that could match airplay and promotion.

As siicli. tlie FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question Sincerely.

JAM Productions, Ltd.

Katu Davull

Katie Garren

# FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington DC 20554

JAN 1 4 2003

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket No. 02-211. (rel. Sept. 23. 2002)

To The Secretary, TCC Commissioners, and Chief. Media Bureau:

Lam writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that title FCC should retain all of the current nicidia ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting Ilic market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry

I support itic LCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, V A in February 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners io come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly aild allow the Ainerican people *to* have a ineaningful say in the process.

As an employee of Jam Productions, Ltd., the country's largest independent concert and theatrical promoter, I can speak first hand about rlic effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experiencedthe detrimental effects of consolidation in the concert industry.

In the concert industry, Clear Channel, the largest concert promoter in the country controls the vast majority of the live concert business. Clear Channel has exclusive contracts with nunierous venues across the country, blocking access to other promoters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fees in the artists they promote are so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to the consumer, resulting is incredibly high-priced concert tickets, outside the reach of many fans. This has caused concert ticket prices and service charges to rise more than 60% over the past 6 years.

The same consolidation to the concert industry is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating the remaining media concentration rules—like diversity aild independence of media outlets will be eroded so greatly as to leave the consumer with fewer choices in music. A few large corporations will control what music gets played and how often; resulting in bland, "safe" programming with little diversity, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests, not the interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporations to vary radio broadcasts, create unique programming, or veer from playing the songs they want to promote, resulting in "less choice and no voice" for the consunier.

In addition, since 1996 radio stations have heconic very tormidable competitors of concert promoters by offering radio airplay and promotion in exchange for illinartists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concert promoters cannot compete against radio stations concerts since u e cannot offer anything that could match airplay and promotion.

As such, the TCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question Sincerely.

JAM Productions. Ltd

#### TEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

JAN 1 4 2003

In Hie Matter of 2002 Bignnial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. MM Docket No. 02- 277, (rel. Sept. 23.2002)

To The Secretary, FCC Commission 218, and Chief, Media Bureau:

Tami writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, tlic Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to proliiote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

Isupport the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to conic out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the Ainerican people to have a ineaningful say in the process.

As an employee of Jam Productions, Ltd., the country's largest independent concert and theatrical promoter, I can speak first hand about the effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced the detrimental effects of consolidation in the concert industry.

In the concert industry, Clear Channel, the largest concert promoter in the country controls the vast majority of the live concert business. Clear Channel has exclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country, blocking access to other promoters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fees to the artists they proniote are so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to the consumer, resulting is incredibly high-priced conceit tickets, outside the reach of many fans. This has caused concert ficket pieces and service charges to rise more than 60% over the past 6 years.

The same consolidation in the concert industry is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating the remaining media concentration rules, ilie diversity aiid independence of media outlets will be eroded so greatly as to leave the consumer with fewer choices in music. A few large corporations will control what music gets played and how often, resulting in bland, "safe" programming with little diversity, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests, not the interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporations to vary radio broadcasts, create unique programming, or veer from playing the songs they want to promote resulting in "less choice and no voice" tor the consumer.

In addition, since 1996 radio stations have become very formidable conjections of concert promoters by offering radio airplay and promotion in exchange for tlic artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concert promoters cannot compete against radio stations concerts since we cannot offer anything that could match airplay and promotion.

As such, the FCC should retain all oftlie current media ownership ruler now in question

ted temper

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

To The Secretary, FCC Commissioners, aiid Chief, Media Bureau:

Lam writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership tules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

I support ilic FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from ilic public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet soinc of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social minest.

With illic serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow illic American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

As an employee of Jam Productions, Ltd., the country's largest independent concert and theatrical promoter. I can speak first hand about the effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced the deturnental effects of consolidation in the coilcert industry

In the concert industry, Clear Channel, ilic largest concert promoter in the country controls the vast majority of the live concert business. Clear Channel has exclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country, blocking access to other promoters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fees to the artists they promote are so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to the consumer, resulting is incredibly high-priced concert tickets, outside the reach of many fans. This has caused concert ticket prices and service charges to rise more than 60% over the past 6 years.

The same consolidation in the concert industry is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating the remaining media concentration rules, illir diversity and independence of media outlets will be eroded so greatly as to leave the consumer with fewer choices in music. A few large corporations will control what inusic gets played and how often, resulting in bland, "safe" programming with little diversity, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests, not rlic interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporations to vary radio broadcasts, create unique programming, or veer from playing the songs they want to promote, resulting in "less choice" and no voice" for the consumer.

In addition, since 1996 radio stations have become very formidable coinpctitors of concert promoters by offering radio amplay and promotion in exchange for ille artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concert promoters cannot compete against radio stations concerts since we caniiot offer anything that could match airplay and promotion

As such, ilic FCC should retain all of Ilie current media ownership rules now in question Sincerely

JAM Productions, Ltd.

Gary Zabinski

January 8, 2003 LIENED & Miles Even

# FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Office of Proposed and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Acl of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

To: The Secretary, FCC Commissioners, and Chief, Media Bureau:

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry

I support the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

As an employee of Jam Productions, Ltd., the country's largest independent concert and theatrical promoter, I can speak first hand about the effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced the detrimental effects of consolidation in the concert industry.

In the concert industry, Clear Channel, the largest concert promoter in the country controls the vast majority of the live concert business. Clear Channel has exclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country, blocking access to other promoters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fees to the artists they promote are so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to the consumer, resulting is incredibly high-priced concert tickets. outside the reach of many fans. This has caused concert ticket prices and service charges to rise more than 60% over the past 6 years.

The same consolidation in the concert industry is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating the remaining inedia concentration rules, the diversity and independence of media outlets will be eroded so greatly as to leave the consumer with fewer choices in music. A few large corporations will control what music gets played and how often, resulting in bland. "safe" programming with little diversity, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests, not the interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large cotporations lo vary radio broadcasts, create unique programming, or veer from playing the songs they want to promote. resulting in "less choice and no voice" for the consumer.

In addition, since 1996 radio stations have become very formidable competitors of concert promoters by offering radio airplay and promotion in exchange for the artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concert promoters cannot compete against radio stations concerts since we cannot offer anything that could match airplay and promotion.

As such, the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question

Sincerely,

MpProductions, Ltd

Sue Naese

HEIVED & INSPECT

JAN 1 4 2003

#### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, M M Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23,2002)

To: The Secretary, FCC Commissioners, and Chief, Media Bureau:

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of lready huge companies in the broadcast industry

I support the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when guestions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, hut a social interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

As an employee of Jam Productions, Ltd., the country's largest independent concert and theatrical promoter, I can speak first hand about the effects of industry Consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced the detrimental effects of consolidation in the concert industry.

In the concert industry, Clear Channel, the largest concert promoter in the country controls the vast majority of the live concert business. Clear Channel has exclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country, blocking access to other promoters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fees to the artists they promote are so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to the consumer, resulting is incredibly high-priced concert tickets, outside the reach of many fans. This has caused concert ticket prices and service charges to rise more than 60% over the past 6 years.

The same consolidation in the concert industry is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating the remaining media concentration rules, the diversity and independence of media outlets will be eroded so greatly as to leave the consumer with fewer choices in music. A few large corporations will control what music gets played and how often. resulting in bland, "safe" programming with little diversity, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests, not the interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporations to vary radio broadcasts, create unique programming, or veer from playing the songs they want to promote, resulting in "less choice and no voice" for the consumer.

In addition, since 1996 radio stations have become very formidable competitors of concert promoters by offering radio airplay and promotion in exchange for the artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concert promoters cannot compete against radio stations concerts since we cannot offer anything that could match airplay and promotion.

 $\Lambda$ s such, the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question

Sincercly

JAM Productions, L

January 8, 2003 JAN 1 4 2003

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulator) Review - Review ut the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 ut the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. MM Docket No. 02-217. (rel. Sept. 23,2002)

To The Secretary, ICC Commissioners, and Chief, Media Bureau:

Tam writing to you today to comment on Docket No. ()2-277, tlie Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's modia market, Istrongly believe that the TCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry

Isopport the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and iffeet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest

With this serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

As the President of Jam. Theatricals, Ltd., which is part of the country-s largest independent concert and theatrical promoter. I can speak first hand about the effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced the detrimental effects of consolidation in the concert industry.

In the concert industry, Clear Channel, ilie largest coilcert promoter in the country controls the vast majority of the concert business. Clear Channel lias exclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country, blocking access to other promoters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fees to the artists they proniote are so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to the consumer, resulting is incredibly high-priced concert tickets, outside the reach of many fans. This has caused concert ticket pieces and service charges to rise inore than 60% over the past 6 years.

The same consolidation in the concert iiidustry is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating the remaining media concentration rules, the diversity and independence of media outlets will be eroded so greatly as to leave the consumer with fewer choices in music. A few large corporations will control what music gets played and how often. resulting in bland, "safe" programming with little diversity, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests, not the interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporations to vary radio broadcasts, create unique programming, or veer from playing the songs they want to promote, resulting in "less choice aild no voice" for the consumer.

In addition, since 1996 radio stations have become very formidable competitors of coilcort promoters by offering radio airplay and promotion in exchange for the artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concert promoters cannot compete against radio stations concerts since we cannot offer anything that could match airplay and promotion

As such, the ECC should retain all of the current media ownership tules now in question,

Jam Thearricals, Ifid.

LOEIVED & INSPECTE.

January 8, 2003

JAN 1 4 2003

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

FOG - MAILROCK

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket Nn. 02-277. (rel. Sept. 23.2002)

To The Secretary, ICC Commissioners, and Chief, Media Bureau:

Tam writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the ICC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting ille market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

I support the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The ratified, lawyerly ahnosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues iiiorc thioroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

As an employee of Jam Theatricals, Ltd., which is part of the country's largest Independent concert and theatrical promoter. I can speak first hand about the effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced the detrimental effects of consolidation in the concert industry.

In the concert industry, Clear Channel, the largest concert promoter in the country controls the vast majority of the live concert business. Clear Channel has exclusive contracts with nunierous venues across the country, blocking access to other promoters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fees in the artists they promote are so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to the consumer resulting is incredibly high-priced concert tickets, outside the reach of many fans. This has caused concert ticket prices and service charges to rise more than 60% over thepast 6 years.

The same consolidation in ille concert industry is affecting the broadcast iiidustry. By eliminating the remaining media concentration rules, the diversity and iiidependence of media outlets will be eroded so greatly as to leave the consumer with fewer choices in music. A few large corporations will control what music gets played and how often, resulting in bland, "safe" programming with little diversity, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests, not the interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporations to vary radio broadcasts, create unique programming, or veer from playing the songs they want to promote, resulting in "less choice aiid no voice" for the consumer.

In addition, since 1996 radio stations have become very formidable competitors of concertpromoters **by** offering radio airplay and promotion in exchange tor the artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concert promoters cannot compete against radio stations concerts since we cannot offer anything that could match airplay and promotion.

As such, ilic LCC should retain all of the current nicdia ouncrsliip rules now in question.

دانس میری

and Theathicuts Lid

January 8,2003 JAN 1 4 2003

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Dncket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23,2002)

To: The Secretary, FCC Commissioners, and Chief. Media Bureau:

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

I support the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Conimissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With the serious impact these nile changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

As an employee of lam Productions, Ltd., the counhy's largest independent conceit and theatrical promoter, 1 can speak first hand about the effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced the detrimental effects of consolidation in the concert industry.

In the concert industry, Clear Channel, the largest concert promoter in the country controls the vast majority of the live concert business. Clear Channel has exclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country, blocking access to other promoters, resulting in lcss choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fees to the artists they promote are so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to the consumer, resulting is incrrdibly high-priced concert tickets, outside the reach of many fans. This has caused concert ticket prices and service charges to sise more than 60% over the past 6 years.

The same consolidation in the concert industry is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating the remaining media concentration rules, the diversity and independence of media outlets will be eroded so greatly as to leave the consumer with fewer choices in music. A few large corporations will control what music gets played and how often, resulting in bland, "safe" programming with little diversity, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests, not the interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporations to vary radio broadcasts, create unique programming, or veer from playing the songs they want to promote, resulting in "less choice and no voice" for the consumer.

In addition, since 1996 radio stations have become very formidable competitors of concert promoters by offering radio airplay and promotion in exchange for the artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concert promoters cannot compete against radio stations concerts since we cannot offer anything that could match airplay and promotion.

As such, the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question

Sincerely

Xan'R Guzik

JAN 1 4 2003

January 8,2003

# FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

TO MAILLOOM!

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. MM Docket No. 02-277. (rel. Scpt. 23, 2002)

To Tlic Sccrelan. FCC Commissioners, and Chief. Mcdia Burcau:

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, tlic Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership niles. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market. I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting llic niarket power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

I support the FCC's plan to liold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I stroiigly encourage tlic Commission to hold similar hearings in all pans of llic country and solicit the widest possible participation froiri the public. The rarified. lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is iiot an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media arc at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With this serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues illore the three to review these issues illore the rule and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

As an ciliployee of Jam Productioiis, Ltd. the country's largest independent concert and theatrical promoter, I call speak lirst hand about the effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced the detrimental effects of consolidation in the concentinustry

In Hie concert industry, Clear Channel, the largest concert promoler in the country controls the vast majority of the live collect business. Clear Channel has exclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country, blocking access to other promoters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fees to the artists they promote are so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to the consumer, resulting is incredibly high-priced concert tickets, outside the reach of many fans. This has caused concert licket prices aiid senice charges to rise more than 60% over the past 6 years.

This same consolidation in the concert industry is affecting this broadcast industry. By eliminating the remaining media concentration rules, the diversity and independence of media outlets will be eroded so greatly as to leave this consumer with fewer choices in music. A few large corporations will control what music gets played and how often, resulliing in blaid. "safe" programming with little diversity, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests, not the interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporations to vary radio broadcasis, create unique programming, or veer from playing the songs they want to promote, resulting in "less choice and no voice" for the consumer.

In addition, silice 1996 radio stations have become very formidable competitors of concert promoters by offering radio airplay and promotion in exchange for the artists' appearance on **their** radio station concerts. Concen proliiorer cannot compete against radio stations concerts since we cannot offer anything that could match airplay and promotion.

As such, the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question

Sincerely,

JAMProductions. Ltd

All Complete
Theresa Altgilbers

CEIVED & INSPECTA

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, DC 20554

FCC-MAN BOT

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review -Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant tu Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket No. 02-277. (ref. Sept. 23, 2002)

To Tlic Secretary, FCC Coininissioners, and Chief. Mcdia Bureau

I am writing to you today to comment on Dockci No 02-277, tlic Biennial Review of the FCC's broadciisr media ownership rules. In its goals to promote coinpetition, diversity aiid localisin in today's inedia market. I strongly believe that Hie FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry

I support tile FCC's plan to hold a public licaring on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I stroiigly encourage tlic Coinnission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation front the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue which questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at slake. I encourage rlic Commissioners to conic out and meet some of the people who do not liave a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest

With the serious impact these nile changes will have on our democracy it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues illore thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

As an employee of Jam Productions. Ltd., the country's largest independent concen and theatrical promoter, I can speak first hand about the effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced the detrimental effects of consolidation in the concen industry

In the coilcort industry, Clear Channel, rlic largest concen proiiioter in thic country controls the vast majority of the live concert busiliess. Clear Channel has esclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country, blockilig liccoss to oilier proiiioters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fees to the artists they promote are so exorbitant, that they inust pass aloiig this cost to the consumer, resulting is incredibly high-priced concert tickets, outside the reach of many fans. This has caused coilicert ticket prices and service charges to rise iliore than 60% over the past 6 years.

This same consolidation in the concert industry is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating the remaining nicdia concentration rules, the diversity and independence of media outlets will be eroded so greatly as to leave the consumer with fewer choices in music. A few large corporations will control what music gels played and how often, resulting in bland, "safe" programming with little diversity, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect; this definition voice of collisuiners will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests, not the interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporations to vary radio broadcasts, create unique programming, or veer from playing the songs they want to promote, resulting in "less choice and no voice" for this consumer

In addition, since 1996 radio stations have becoincivery formidable competitors of concert pronioters by offering riidio airplay aiid proinotion in exchange Tor the artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concert promoters cannot compete against radio stations concens since we cannot offer anything that could match airplay and promotion

As such, thic FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question

Sincerely,

JAM Productions. Ltd

C- WELL PHES
Lavotte Potts

January 8.2003

JAN 1 4 2003

January 0.2

### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

ECC - MAILBOCA

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket No. 02- 277, (rel. Scpt. 23, 2002)

To: The Secretary, FCC Commissioners, and Chief, Media Bureau:

I am writing to you today to comment on Docker No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current tnedia ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the piblic interest by liiniting the market power of already huge coinpanics in the broadcast industry.

I support the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an **FCC** rule in a propriate decision-niakilig venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

Wirh the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issties more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

As an employee of Jam Productions. Ltd., the country's largest independent concert and theatrical promoter, I can speak first hand about the effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced the detrimental effects of consolidation in the concert industry.

In the concert industry, Clear Channel, the largest concen promoter in the country controls tlie vast majority of the live concert business. Clear Channel has exclusive contracts with tiumerous venues across the country, blocking access to other promoters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Cleat Channel's guaranteed fees to the artists they promote are so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to the coilisunier, resulting is incredibly high-priced concert tickets, outside the reach of many fans. This has caused coilicert ticket prices and service charges to rise more than 60% over the past 6 years.

The same consolidation in the concert industry is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating the remaining media conceiirration rules, the diversity and independence of media outlets will be eroded so greatly as to leave the consunier with fewer choices in inusic. A few large corporations will control what music gets played and how often, resulting in bland, "safe" programming with little diversity, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests, not the interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporations to vary radio broadcasts, create unique programming, or veer from playing the songs they want to proinote, resulting in "less choice and no voice" for the consumer.

In addition, since 1996 radio stations have become very formidable competitors of concert promoters by offering radio airplay and promotion in exchange for the artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concert promoters cannot compete against radio stations concerts since we cannot offer anything that could match airplay and promotion.

As such, the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question.

Sincerely.

JAM Productions, Ltd.

JUN 17 Bull

### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

JAN 1 4 2003

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Rules Rulemaking, MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23,2002)

To: The Secretary. FCC Commissioners, and Chief, Media Bureau:

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now  $\dot{n}$  question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry

I support the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. Istrongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on ourdemocracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

As an employee of Jam Productions, Ltd., the country's largest independent concert and theatrical promoter, I can speak first hand about the effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced the detrimental effects of consolidation in the concert industry.

In the concert industry, Clear Channel, the largest concert promoter in the country controls the vast majority of the live concert business. Clear Channel has exclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country, blocking access to other promoters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fees to the artists they promote are so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to the consumer, resulting is incredibly high-priced concert tickets, outside the reach of many fans. This has caused concert ticket prices and service charges to rise more than 60% over the past 6 years.

The same consolidation in the concert industry is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating the remaining media concentration rules, the diversity and independence of media outlets will be eroded so greatly as to leave the consumer with fewer choices in music. A few large corporations will control what music gets played and how often, resulting in bland, "safe" programming with little diversity, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests, not the interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporations to vary radio broadcasts, create unique programming, or veer from playing the songs they want to promote, resulting in "less choice and no voice" for the consumer.

In addition, since 1996 radio stations have become very formidable competitors of concert promoters by offering radio airplay and promotion in exchange for the artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concert promoters cannot compete against radio stations concerts since we cannot offer anything that could match airplay and promotion.

As such. the FCC should rerain all of the current media ownership rules now in question,

Sincerely.

JAM Productions. Ltd.

Krassi Boboshevsky

JAN 1 4 2003

#### FEDEKAL. COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Dncket Nu. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23,2002)

To The Secretary, FCC Cointnissioliers, and Chief. Media Bureau.

I am writing to you today io coniinent on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should relail all of the current media ownership tules now in question. These niles serve the piblic interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industn

I support tlic FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond. VA in February 2003. I strongly encourage the Coinmission Lo hold similar hearings in all parts of the couniry and solicit lhe widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest

With Hie serious impact these nile changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Cominission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

As iiii employee of Jain Production Ltd, ille country's largest independent concert aud theatrical promoter. Ican speak lirst hand about rile effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced the detrimental effects of consolidation in the conject industry.

In itic concert iiidusrry. Clear Channel, the largest concen promoter in the country controls the vast majority of tlic live concert business. Clear Channel has exclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country, blocking access to other promoters, resulting in less choice available io consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fees to the artists they promote are so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to the consumer, resulting is incredibly high-priced concert tickets, outside the reach of many Fans. This lias caused coilicert ticker prices and service cliarges to rise more than 60% over the past 6 years.

The same consolidation in the concert industry is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating the reinaliling media concentration niles, the diversity and independence of media outlets will be croded so greatly as to leave the consumer with fewer choices in music. A few large corporations will control what music gels played and how ofteil, resulting in bland, "safe" programming with little diversily, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already arc) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests, not like interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporations to vary radio broadcasts, create unique programming, or veer from playing the songs they want to profiliole, resulting in "less choice and no voice" for the consumer

In addition, silice 1996 radio slations have become very formidable conjections of concert promoters by offering radio airplay and promotion in exchange For the artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concert promoters cannot compete against radio stations concerts silice we cannot offer anything that could match airplay and promotion.

As such, the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question

Sincerely

IAM Productions, Lid

Suzanne Santos

ECEIVED & INSPECT

January 8 2001

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

TOO MAILPOOL

In the Matter uf 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket Nu. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

To Tlic Secretary, FCC Commissioners, and Chief, Media Burcau.

Tam writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, thic Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast inedia ownership rilles. In its goals to proinote competition, diversity and localism in today's inedia market. I strongly believe that Hic FCC should retain all of the current inedia ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the piblic interest by limiting the marker power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry

I support the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all pans of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The ranfied, lawyerly atinosphiere of an FCC ruleinaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our niedia are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to conic our aiid meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our deflioeracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues inore thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

As imemployee of Jain Productions. Ltd.. the country's largest indepelled concert and theatrical promoter, I can speak first hand about the effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries. having esperienced the detrimental effects of consolidation in the concert industry.

In the coilcorl industry, Clear Channel, the largest concert promoter in the country controls tlic vast majority of tlic live concert business. Clear Channel has esclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country. blockilig liccoss to other promoters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fees to the artists they promote are so esorbitant, that tlicy must pass along this cost to the consumer, resulting is incredibly high-priced concert lickets, outside the reach of inany fans. This has caused concert licket prices and service charges to rise more than 60% over the past 6 years.

The same consolidation in the concert industry is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating the remaining illication concentration niles, the diversity and independence of incdia outlets will be croded so greatly as to leave the consumer with fewer choices in music. A few large corporations will control what music gets played and how often, resulliing in bland, "safe" programining with little diversity, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the deinocratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests, not the interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporations to vary radio broadcasts, create unique programining, or veer from playing the songs they want to promote, resulting in "less choice and no voice" Tor the consumer.

In addition, since 1996 radio stations have become very formidable competitors of concen pronioters by offering radio airplay and promotion in exchange for the artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concert promoters cannot compere against radio stations concerts since we cannot offer anything that could match airplay and promotion.

As such, the FCC should retain all of the current inedia ownership rules now in question

Sincerely

JAM Productions, Ltd.

Melissa M Gutierrez

# FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

JAN 1 4 2003

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23,2002)

To: The Secretary, FCC Commissioners, and Chief, Media Bureau:

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership tules now in question. These tules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

I support the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I strongly ciicourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With the serious impact these tule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission **take** the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

**As** an employee of Jam Productions, Ltd., the country's largest independent concert and theatrical promoter, I can speak first hand about the effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced the detrimental effects of consolidation in the concert industry.

In the concert industry, Clear Channel, the largest concert promoter in the country controls the vast majority of the live concert business. Clear Channel has exclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country, blocking access to other promoters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fees to the artists they promote are so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to the consumer, resulting is incredibly high-priced concert tickets, outside the reach of many **fans**. This has caused concert ticket prices and service charges to rise more than **60%** over the past 6 years.

The same consolidation in the concert industry is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating the remaining media concentration rules, the diversity and independence of media outlets will be eroded *so* greatly as to leave the consumer with fewer choices in music. A few large corporations will control what music gets played and how often, resulting in bland, "safe" programming with little diversity, dimunishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests, not the interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is **no** incentive by large corporations to vary radio broadcasts, create unique programming, **or** veer from playing the songs they want to promote, resulting in "less choice and no voice" for the consumer.

In addition, since 1996 radio stations have become very formidable competitors of concert promoters by offering radio airplay and promotion in exchange for the artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concert promoters cannot compete against radio stations concerts since we cannot offer anything that could match airplay and promotion.

As such, the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership tules now in question

Sincerely.

Keith Moschea
JAM Productions, Lrd

JAN 1 4 2003

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review uf the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Ruler and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket Nu. 02-277. (ref. Sept. 23, 2002)

To The Secretary, FCC Commissioners, and Chief, Media Bureau:

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's mediamarket, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the piblic interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

I support the FCC's plan to hold a public licanng on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I strongly circourage ilic Commission to hold similar hearings in all **pans** of the country and solicit tlic widest possible participation froiii tlic public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as tlie freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners Io come out and meet some of the people who do nor have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With the scriois impact these rule changes will have on our democracy. It is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process

As intemployee of Jam Productions. Ltd. the country's largest independent concert and theatrical promoter. I can speak first hand about the effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced the detrimental effects of consolidation in the broadcast industries.

In the concert industry, Clear Cliannel, the largest concert promoier in the country controls the vast majority of the live concert business. Clear Channel has exclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country blocking inccess to other promoters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fees to Ilic artists they promote are so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to rile consumer, resulting is incredibly high-priced concert tickets, outside the reach of many fans. This has caused coliceri ticket process and service charges to rise more than 60% over the past 6 years.

This same consolidation in the concert industry is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating the remaining media concentration rules, the diversity and independence of incdia outlets will be eroded so greatly as to leave the consumer with fewer clioices in inusic. A few large corporations will conirol what music gels played aild how often resulting in bland. "safe" programming with little diversity, diministring the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests, iiot ilic interests of lic public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporations to vary radio broadcasis, create unique programming, or veer from playing the songs they want to promote, resulting in "less choice and no voice" for this consumer.

In addition, since 1996 radio stations have becoine very formidable competitors of concert promoters by offering radio airplay and promotion in exchange for the artists' appearance on iheir radio station concerts. Concert promoters cannot coilipete against radio stations concerts since we cannot offer anything that could match airplay and promotion.

As such, the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership niles now in question Sincerely

JAM Productions, Lid.

Ju Lidusli

January 8, 2003 JAN 1 4 2003

#### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter 012002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket No. 02- 277. (rel. Sept. 23,2002)

To: The Secretary, FCC Commissioners, and Chief, Media Bureau:

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

I support the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation From the public. The rarified, lawverly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when guestions as profound as the Freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

As an employee of Jam Productions, Ltd., the country's largest independent concen and theatrical promoter, I can speak first hand about the effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced the detrimental effects of consolidation in the concert industry

In the concert industry, Clear Channel, the largest concert promoter in the country controls the vast majority of the live concert business. Clear Channel has exclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country, blocking access to other promoters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fees to the artists they promote are so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to the consumer, resulting is incredibly high-priced concert tickets, outside the reach of many fans. This has caused concert ticket prices and service charges to rise more than 60% over the past 6 years.

The same consolidation in the concert industry is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating the remaining media concentration rules, the diversity and independence of media outlets will be eroded so greatly as to leave the consumer with fewer choices in music. A few large corporations will control what music gets played and how often, resulting in bland, "safe" programming with little diversity, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests, not the interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporations to vary radio broadcasts, create unique programming, or veer from playing the songs they want to promote, resulting in "less choice and no voice" for the consumer.

In addition, since 1996 radio stations have become very formidable competitors of concert promoters by offering radio airplay and promotion in exchange for the artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concert promoters cannot compete against radio stations concerts since we cannot offer anything that could match airplay and eromotion.

As such, the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question

Donná Sue Van Cleaf-Fish



FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

JAN 1 4 2003

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review, - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rines and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23,2002)

To Tlic Secrolan. FCC Coininissioiicrs. and Chicf. Media Bureau.

Tam writing to you today Io comment on Docket No 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcasi iiiedia ownership rules In its goals to proincte competition, diversity and localism in today's media market. I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current incdia ownership rules now in question. These niles serve the public interest by limiting the iliarket power of already huge companies in the broadcast industq.

I siippon Ilic FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I strongly ciicourage llic Coininission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. Tlic rarified, lawyerly aimosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to coinc out and meet some of Ilie people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our deinocracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issties inore thoroughly and allow the Aincnean people to have a meaningful say in the process.

As an employee of Jam Productions. Ltd , tlic country's largest independent concert and theatrical promoter. I can speak first hand about the effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced llie detrimental effects of consolidation in lie concert industry

In Hic concert industry. Clear Channel, the largest concert promoter in the country controls the vast majority of tlic live coilcert business Clear Channel lias exclusive contracts with nunicrous venues across the country, blocking iicccss io other promoters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fccs to tile artists they promote arc so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to the consumer, resulting is incredibly high-priced concentickets, outside the reach of many fans. This has caused coilccri ticket pnccs aiid service cliarges to rise inore tlian 60% over the past 6 years.

Tlic saiile coiisolidatioii in tlic coiicen industry is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating the remaining iiicdia concentration rules. Hie diversity and iiidependence of incdia outlets will be eroded so greatly as to leave the consumer with fewer choices in music. A few large corporations will control what music gets played and how often, resulting in bland, "safe" programming with little diversity, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporation work to serve their own iiiicrcsis. iiot the interests of tlie public. Without tlic current rules in place, tlierc is no incentive by large corporations to vary radio broadcasts, creite unique programming, or veer from playing llic songs they want to proinotc. resultiig in "less clioice aiid no voice" for the consumer.

In addition, silice 1996 radio stations have becoinc very formidable coinpetitors of concert prolificiers by offering radio airplay aiid promotion in exchange Tor tlic mists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concert promoters cannot compete against radio stations concerts since we cannot offer anything that could inatch airplay and promotion.

As siicli. ilic FCC should retain all of Ilic current media ownership rules now in question

Sincercly

JAM Produclioiis. LId garage Marine and Salar Salar

Capital Page -

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

January 8, 2003 JAN 1 4 2003

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulator) Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket Nu. 02- 277. (ref. Sept. 23, 2002)

To Tlic Secretary, FCC Coinirussioners, and Chief, Media Bureau:

I am writing to you loday to comment on Dockei No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership niles. In its goals to promote coinpetiiion, diversity and localism in today's incdia market, 1 strongly believe that Hie FCC should retain all of the current inedia ownership rules now in question. These rules serve tlic public interest by limiting the market power of already huge coinpanies in the broadcast industry

I support like FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of thic country aiid solicit thic widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue a heu questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to coinc out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest

With Ilic serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take tlic time to review thicse issues illiore thioroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process

As an employee of Jam Productions, Ltd., the country's largest indepelident concenand theatrical projects. I can speak first hand about Hie effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experieiized the detrimental effects of consolidation in the concert industry.

In the concert industry, Clear Channel, tlic largest concert promoter in the country controls the vast majority of the live concert business. Clear Channel has esclusive contracts with numerous venues across the couiltry, blocking access to other promoters, resulling in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed focs to the artists they prointee arc so exprisions, that they must pass along this cost to tlic consumer, resulting is incredibly high-priced concert tickels, ourside the reach of many fans. This lias caused concert ticket prices and service charges to rise iiiore than 60% over the past 6 years.

The same consolidation in the concert industry is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating the remaining ijicdia concentration rules, the diversity aiid independence of incdia outlets will be eroded so greatly as to leave rlie consumer with fewer clioices in inusic. A few large corporations will control what inusic gets played and how offcii resulliig in bland. "safe" programming with little diversity, diminislung the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, tlic deiiiocralic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already arc) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests, not the interests of the public. Without the current rnlcs in place, there is no incentive by large corporations to vary radio broadcasts, create unique programining, or veer from playing the songs they want to promote resulting in "loss choice and no voice" for Ilie consumer.

In addition, since 1996 radio stations have become very formidable competitors of concerl proincters by offering radio airplay and proinotion in exchange for the artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concert proinoters cannot coilipete against radio stations concens since we cannot offer anything that could match airplay and projiiotioji

As such, tlic FCC should regain all of rlic current media ownership rules now in question. Sincerely.

JAM Productions. Ltd

January 8. 2003

#### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

IAN 1 4 2003

COC. MAILROC

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant tu Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Dncket Nn. 02- 277. (rel. Sept. 23,2002)

To The Sccrelan FCC Commissioners, and Chief Media Bureau

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcasl media ownership rules In its goals to promole competition, diversity and localisin in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC sliould retain all of the current inedia ownership rules now in question. Tliese rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

I support llic FCCs plaii to hold a public licaring on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. 1 stroiigly encourage llic Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country aiid solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC ruleinaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage llie Commissioners to coinc out aid meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest

With Ilic serious impact rhose nile changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues inore thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

As an cijiployee of Jam Productions. Ltd., rlic country's largest independeiit concen and theatrical promoter. I can speak first hand about lie effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced lie detrimental effects of consolidation in the concert industry.

In ilie coiiccrl industry, Clear Channel, the largest concert promoter in llic country controls the vast majority of the live concert business. Clear Channel has exclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country, blocking iiccess lo otlicr proiiioters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fees to the artists they promole are so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to ilie consumer, resulting is incredibly high-priced concerl tickets, ourside the reach of many fans. This has caused concert ticket prices and service charges to risc more tlian 60% over the past 6 years.

This same consolidation in the concert industry is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating the remaining iiicdia concentration rules, the diversity aiid independence of media oullets will be eroded so greatly as to leave llie consumer with fewer clioices in music A few large corporations will coiiuol what music gets played and how offcii resulting in bland, "safe" programming with little diversity, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests, not rlie interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporations • vary radio broadcasts, create unique programming, or veer from playing the songs they want In promote, resulting in "less choice aiid no voice" for tlic consumer.

In addition, since 1996 radio stations have become very formidable competitors of concen promoters by offering radio airplay aiid promotion in exchange For the mists' appearance on their radio station concens. Concert proiiiolers cannot compete against radio stations concerts since we caniiot offer anything that could match airplay aiid promotion.

AS such, the FCC slight retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question.

Sincerely

JAM Productions, Ltd. John Bell

January 8, 2003 ALCEIVED & INSPECTAL

#### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

JAN 1 4 2003

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Compession Relief Commission of the Commission of and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

To: The Secretary, FCC Conimissioners, and Chief, Media Bureau:

I am writing to you today to conjilient on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules scree the public interest by limiting the marker power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

I support tlic FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I strongly ciicourage the Commission to liold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound a i the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With the serious impact rhose rule changes will liave on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process

As an employee of Jam Productions, Ltd., the country's largest independent concen and theatrical promoter. I can speak first hand about the effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced the detrimental effects of consolidation in the concert industry.

In the concert industry. Clear Channel, the largest concert promoter in the country controls the vast majority of the live concert business. Clear Channel has esclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country. blocking access to other promoters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaraiited fees to the artists they promote are so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to the consumer, resulting is incredibly high-priced concert tickets, outside the reach of many fans. This has caused concert ticket prices and service charges to rise more than 60% over the past 6 years.

The same consolidation in the concert industry is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating the remaining media concentration rules, the diversity and independence of of outlets will be eroded so greatly as to leave the consumer with fewer choices in music. A few large corporations will control what music gets played and how often. resulting in bland, "safe" programnling with little diversity, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democraric voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own inlerests. nor the interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporalions to vary radio broadcasts, create unique programming, or veer from playing the songs they want to promote, resulting in "Icss choice and no voice" for the consumer.

In addition, since 1996 radio stations have hecome very formidable competitors of concert promoters by offering radio airplay and promotion in exchange for the artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concert promoters cannot compete against radio ttations concerts since we cannot offer anything that could match airplay and promotion.

As such, the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question

Sincerely,

Cancella (0

JAN 1 4 2003

#### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

To Tlic Secretary, FCC Commissioners, and Chief, Media Bureau:

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to proinote competition, diversity and localisin in today's media market. I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the piblic interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

I support llic FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I strongly citicourage tlic Commission to hold similar hearings in all pans of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. Tlic rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is no! an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. 1 encourage tlie Commissioners to coine out and meet some of tlic people who do iiot have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With the scriois impact tlicse rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow tlic American people to have a meaningful say in tlic process

As im ciliployed of Jam Productions. Ltd.. the country's largest independelit concert alid theatrical promoter, I call speak first hand about the effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced the detrimental effects of collisolidation in the collicen industry.

In the concert industry, Clear Channel, the largest concert promoter in the country controls the vast majority of llic live colicer business. Clear Channel has exclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country, blocking access to other promoters, resulling in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaraiiteed fees to the artists they promote are so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to the consumer, resulting is incredibly high-priced concen tickels, outside the reach of many fans. This has caused colicen ticket prices and service cliarges to rise more than 60% over tile past 6 years.

This same coiisolidation in the concentinuity is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating the remaining media concentration rules, the diversity and independence media outlets will be eroded so greatly as to leave the consumer with fewer choices in music. A few large corporations will control what music gets played and how often. resulliing in blaild. "safe" programming with little diversity, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests, not illic interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporations to v an radio broadcasts, create unique programming, or veer from playing the songs they want to promote, resulliing in "less choice and no voice" for the consumer.

In addition, silicc 1996 radio stations have become very formidable competitors of concert promoters by offering radio airplay aild promotion in exchange for the artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concert promoters calinol compete against radio stations concens since we cannot offer anything that could match airplay iiiid promotion

As siicli. Hic PCC should retain all of the current media ownership tules now in question

Sincerely

110//

JAM Productions

Scann Elizabeth Price

S 2000

January 8, 2003

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

JAN 1 4 2003

FCC -MAILROO

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's **Broadcast Ownership Rules** and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23,2002)

To: The Secretary, FCC Commissioners, and Chief, Media Bureau:

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No.02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all ofthe current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

Isupport the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. Istrongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all pans of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, hut a social interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy. it is important that the Commission take the lime to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

As an employee of Jam Productions, Ltd., the country's largest independent concert and theatrical promoter, I can speak first hand about the effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced the detrimental effects of consolidation in the concert industry.

In the concert industry, Clear Channel, the largest concert promoter in the country controls the vast majority of the live concert business. Clear Channel has exclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country, blocking access lo other promoters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fees to the artists they promote are so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to the consumer. resulting is incredibly high-priced concert tickets, outside the reach of many fans. This has caused concert ticket prices and service charges to rise more than 60% over the past 6 years.

The same consolidation in the concert industry is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating the remaining media concentration rules, the diversity and independence of media outlets will be eroded so greatly as to leave the consumer with fewer choices in music. A few large corporations will control what music gets played and how often, resulting in bland, "safe" programming with little diversity, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democratic voice of consumers will he ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests, not the interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporalions to vary radio broadcasts, create unique programming, or veer from playing the songs they want to promote, resulting in "less choice and no voice" for the consumer.

In addition, since 1996 radio stations have become very formidable competitors of concert promoters by offering radio airplay and promotion in exchange for the artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concert promoters cannot compete against radio stations concerts since we cannot offer anything that could match airplay and promotion.

**As** such, the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question Sincerely,

JAM Productions, Ltd.

Miller Holland

Mike LeMaistre

JAN 1 4 2003

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Tologomerication. Rulemaking, MM Docker No. 02- 277, (rel. Sept. 23,2002)

To: The Secretary, FCC Commissioners, and Chief, Media Bureau:

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

Isupport the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. Istrongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when guestions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

As an employee of Jam Productions, Ltd., the country's largest independent concert and theatrical promoter, I can speak first hand about the effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced the detrimental effects of consolidation in the concert industry.

In the concert industry, Clear Channel, the largest concert promoter in the country controls the vast majority of the live concert business. Clear Channel has exclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country. blocking access to other promoters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fees to the artists they promote are so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to the consumer, resulting is incredibly high-priced concert tickets, outside the reach of many fans. This has caused concert ticket prices and service charges to rise more than 60% over the past 6 years.

The same consolidation in the concert industry is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating the remaining media concentration rules, the diversity and independence of media outlets will be eroded so greatly as to leave the consumer with fewer choices in music. A few large Corporations will control what music gets played and how often, resulting in bland, "safe" programming with little diversity, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests, not the interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporations to vary radio broadcasts, create unique programming, or veer from playing the songs they want to promote, resulting in "less choice and no voice" for the consumer.

In addition, since 1996 radio stations have become very formidable competitors of concert promoters by offering radio airplay and promotion in exchange for the artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concert promoters cannot compete against radio stations concens since we cannot offer anything that could match airplay and promotion.

As such, the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question

Sincerely,

JAM Productions, Ltd.

Andy Cirzan

ACCEIVED & INSPECTED

January 8, 2003

JAN 1 4 2003

### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket No. 02- 277, (rel. Sept. 23, 2002)

To The Secretary, FCC Commissioners, and Chief. Media Bureau.

Tam writing to you today to comment on Dockei No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity aid localism in today's media market. I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of already huge companies in the broadcast industy

I suppost the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I strongly ciicourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of tlic country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The ranfied, lawyerly amosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to coinc out and meet some of this people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, but a social interest

With Hic scrioiis impact tlicsc rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission rake rlie time to review these issties more thoroughly and allow tile American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

As an employee of Jam Productions, Ltd., Hie country's largest independent concert and theatrical promoter, I can speak first hand about the effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced the detrimental effects of consolidation in the concert industry

In the concert industry, Clear Channel, the largest concert proincier in the country controls tlic vast majority of tlie live concert business. Clear Channel has exclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country, blocking access to other promoters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fees to ilic artists they promote arc so exorbitant, that they must pass along tlus cost to the consumer, resulling is incredibly high-priced concert tickets, outside the reach of many fans. This has caused coilcort ticket prices and service charges to rise illione than 60% over Illic past 6 years

Tlic same consolidation in the concert industry is affecting tlic broadcast industry. By eliminating tlic remaining iiiedia concentration rules, tlic diversity and independence of iiiedia outlets will be eroded so greatly as to leave the consumer with fewer clioices in music. A few large corporations will control what music gets played and liow oftei resultiiig in bland, "safe" programming with little diversity, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests, jiot the interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporations to vary radio broadcasts, create unique programming, or veer from playing the songs they want to promote, resulting in "less choice and no voice" for the consumer.

In addition, silicc 1996 radio stations have become very formidable conjectitors of concert promolers by offering radio airplay and promotion in exchange for Ilic artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concen promoters cannot compete against radio stations concens since we cannot offer anything that could matcli airplay and proinotion

As siicli, the FCC should retain all of the current incdia ownership rules **now** in question.

Sincerely.

JAM Productions. Ltd

## FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington DC 20554

IAN 1 4 2003

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Ruics and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Tolecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept 23, 2002)

To Tlic Secretiin, FCC Commissioners, and Chief, Mcdia Burcau:

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, tlic Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast iiiedia ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all of the current inedia ownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public iiitcrest by limiting the iiiarket power of already huge companies in the broadcast industry.

I support thic FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, VA in February 2003. I strongly encourage llic Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to coine out and meet soine of the people who do not have a financial interest in thus issue, but a social interest

With the scrioiis impact these rule changes will liave on our democracy, it is important that the Commission lake the time to review these issues inore thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

As an ciliployee of Jam Productions. Ltd., the country's largest independent concert and theatrical proincier, I can speak first hand about the effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced the detrimental effects of consolidation in the colicert industry.

In the concert industry, Clear Channel, the largest coilcert promoter in the country controls tlic **vast** majority of the live concert business. Clear Channel has exclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country, blocking itecess to otlicr promoters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fees to the anists tlicy promote are so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to tlie consumer, resultilig is incredibly high-priced concert tickets, outside the reach of many fans. This has caused coilcert ticket prices and service charges to rise more than 60% over the past 6 years.

This same consolidation in the concent industry is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating die remaining media collectration rules, the diversity and independence of incdia outlets will be eroded so greatly as to leave the collisismer with fewer choices in music. A few large corporations will control what music gets played and how often resulting in bland. "safe" programming with little diversity. diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests, inot the interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporations to vary radio broadcasts, create unique programming, or veer from playing the songs they want to promote, resulting in "less choice and no voice" for the collisiimer.

In addition, since 1996 radio stations have become very formidable competitors of concent promoters by offering radio airplay and proinolion in exchange for the artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concert proiiiolers cannot coinpete against radio stations concerts since we cannot offer anything that could match airplay and promotion

As such, the FCC should relail all of the current media ownership rules now in question

Sincerely

Nathan Benditzson

4 Productions.

ECEIVED & INSPECTED

# FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC 20554

JAN **1 4** 2003

In the Matter of 2002 Biennial Regulatory Review - Review of the Commission's Broadcast Ownership Rules and Other Rules Adopted Pursuant to Section 202 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, MM Docket No. 02-277, (rel. Sept. 23,2002)

To: The Secretary, FCC Commissioners, and Chief, Media Bureau:

I am writing to you today to comment on Docket No. 02-277, the Biennial Review of the FCC's broadcast media ownership rules. In its goals to promote competition, diversity and localism in today's media market, I strongly believe that the FCC should retain all ofthe current mediaownership rules now in question. These rules serve the public interest by limiting the market power of lready huge companies in the broadcast industry.

I support the FCC's plan to hold a public hearing on this matter in Richmond, V A in February 2003. I strongly encourage the Commission to hold similar hearings in all parts of the country and solicit the widest possible participation from the public. The rarified, lawyerly atmosphere of an FCC rulemaking is not an appropriate decision-making venue when questions as profound as the freedom of our media are at stake. I encourage the Commissioners to come out and meet some of the people who do not have a financial interest in this issue, hut a social interest.

With the serious impact these rule changes will have on our democracy, it is important that the Commission take the time to review these issues more thoroughly and allow the American people to have a meaningful say in the process.

As an employee of Jam Productions, Ltd., the country's largest independent concert and theatrical promoter, I can speak first hand about the effects of industry consolidation in the broadcast industries, having experienced the detrimental effects of consolidation in the concert industry.

In the concert industry, Clear Channel, the largest concert promoter in the country controls the vast majority of the live concert business. Clear Channel has exclusive contracts with numerous venues across the country, blocking access to other promoters, resulting in less choice available to consumers in live entertainment. Additionally, Clear Channel's guaranteed fees to the artists they promote are so exorbitant, that they must pass along this cost to the consumer, resulting is incredibly high-priced concert tickets, outside the reach of many fans. This has caused concert ticket prices and service charges to rise more than 60% over the past 6 years.

The same consolidation in the concert industry is affecting the broadcast industry. By eliminating the remaining media concentration rules, the diversity and independence of media outlets will be eroded so greatly as to leave the consumer with fewer choices in music. A few large corporations will control what music gets played and how often, resulting in bland, "safe" programming with little diversity, diminishing the quality of radio broadcasts. In effect, the democratic voice of consumers will be ignored (as they already are) as the large corporations work to serve their own interests, not the interests of the public. Without the current rules in place, there is no incentive by large corporations to vary radio broadcasts, create unique programming, or veer from playing the songs they want to promote, resulting in "less choice and no voice" for the consumer.

In addition, since 1996 radio stations have become very formidable competitors of concert promoters by offering radio airplay and promotion in exchange for the artists' appearance on their radio station concerts. Concert promoters cannot compete against radio stations concerts since we cannot offer anything that could match airplay and promotion.

As such, the FCC should retain all of the current media ownership rules now in question, Sincerely,

JAM Productions, Ltd.

David Rockland